

REMARKS

Claims 3, 5, 6, and 10-12 are pending in this application. Claims 3, 5, 6, and 10-12 stand rejected. In light of the remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejects claims 3, 5, 6, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,797,125 (“Hirohama”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,430 (“Sawada”). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or combine references to arrive at the claimed subject matter. The prior art references must also teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim in question. See, M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j). A reference can only be used for what it clearly discloses or suggests. See, In re Hummer, 113 U.S.P.Q. 66 (C.C.P.A. 1957); In re Stencel, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Here, the references, whether taken individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the invention claimed by the Applicant.

Among the limitations of independent claims 3 and 10 not present in the cited references is “an attachable and detachable voice message data storage medium storing the plurality of voice message data, the voice message data being in a plurality of languages organized in classes according to a language of the voice

message data”. The Office Action asserts that the above-recited limitation is disclosed in Hirohama at column 3, lines 15-29 and 43-52. However, the cited portion of Hirohama fails to disclose Applicant’s explicitly recited limitation. According to Applicant’s claimed limitation, the storage medium stores a plurality of languages organized in classes.

In the cited portion of Hirohama, the terminal unit (4A, 4B, ... 4n) has a storage means 12 in which specific guide information is stored. The guide information is stored on storage means 12. Each of the storage means 12 for each of the individual terminal units store “specific pieces of guide information for individual booths 2A to 2n are each stored in any one of more than one language (any one of various languages such as Japanese, English, German, and French).... See column 3, lines 21-23 (emphasis added). Thus, in Hirohama, the storage means 12 only store one of a plurality of languages. Further, when reading column 3, lines 42-51, it is clear that only a single language is written into the storage means for any individual terminal unit.¹

Thus, Hirohama fails to disclose the explicitly recited limitation of a voice message data storage medium storing the plurality of voice message data, the voice message data being in a plurality of languages.

The Office Action includes Sawada, not to show the above-recited limitation, but to disclose that the storage medium is attachable and detachable.

¹ Hirohama explicitly recites that the central control center has a “write processing section 27 which writes into the storage means 12 in said terminal unit 4A, etc. in a particular language (for example, Japanese for the storage means 12 in terminal 4A, English for the storage means 12 in terminal 4B, German for the storage means 12 in the terminal 4n, etc.)”

However, Sawada does not cure the deficiency discussed above in that Hirohama does not teach the memory having a plurality of languages. Sawada only teaches a single language in each storage means.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 3. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 3, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Hirohama and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 5 and 6 should also be allowed.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claim 10. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claim 10, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Hirohama and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 11 and 12 should also be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the

Application No.: 09/779,269

Docket No.: G0126.0199/P199

Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: July 30, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ian R. Blum

Registration No.: 42,336

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400

Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs